An advisory body to the California State Board of Education $D\ r\ a\ f\ t$ MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Minutes of Meeting - D r a f t January 20-21, 2000

California Department of Education 721 Capitol Mall, Board Room 166 Sacramento, California 95814

1. Full Curriculum Commission Meeting, Thursday, January 20, 2000

<u>Curriculum Commissioners--Present</u>:

Marilyn Astore, Chair Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair

Roy Anthony

Mary Coronado Calvario

Lora L. Griffin

Richard Schwartz

Susan Stickel

Catherine Banker

Ken Dotson

Veronica N. Norris

Leslie Schwarze

Karen S. Yamamoto

Commissioners--Absent:

Joseph Nation (Present 1 hr. p.m.1/20) Viken Hovsepian Barbara Smith

Dede Alpert, Member of the Senate Jack Scott, Member of the Assembly

State Board of Education Liaison--Present

Marion Joseph

California Department of Education Staff:

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Exec. Director, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Div.

Terry Emmett, Administrator, CFIR Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, CFIR

Sandi Adams-Jones, Staff Service Manager I, CFIR
Nancy Brynelson, Consultant, CFIR
Beverly Cole, Office Technician, CFIR
Anna Emery, AGPA, CFIR
Barbara Jeffus, Consultant, CFIR
Deborah Keys, Consultant, CFIR

Lily Roberts, Consultant, CFIR

Sonia Hernandez, Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Branch, CDE

- A. <u>Call to Order</u>. Commissioner Astore, Chair, called the meeting of the full Commission to order at 9:30
- B. <u>Salute to the Flag</u>. Commissioner Yamamoto led the Commissioners, staff, and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- C. Review of Agenda and Report of Chair of the Curriculum Commission. Ms. Astore then reviewed the agenda for the next two days. She asked that all Commissioners try to be present the entire meeting in order to ensure a quorum is present. Ms. Astore referenced the January Commission Letter to the President of the State Board. She described the unanimous support for the ELA/ELD criteria at the December hearing of the SBE. She thanked the other Commissioners involved in the presentation to the Board, Commissioners Abarca, Schwarze, Norris, and Coronado.

She also discussed the Science augmentation of the STAR assessment and indicated the Board and the Department has asked the Commission to give input on the assessment issues. Also, the SBE voted to

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

shorten the Reading/English-Language Arts and Mathematics adoption timelines to get materials to districts earlier, so that they may pilot materials in schools. The Board took input from all stakeholders to make the decision to shorten the timelines, which requires the Commission to determine how to make the adjustments guided by compressed timelines. In addition, Ms. Astore reported that the SBE approved the Electronic Learning Resources Ad Hoc Committee to become a full subject matter committee. The March State Board meeting would be in Los Angeles, which will include the final action by the Board on the Science 2000 Adoption.

Chair Astore also indicated that the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) has requested a closer relationship with the Curriculum Commission to be more reflective of the Commission's work to implement a standards-based system.

D. Executive Director Report by Sherry Skelly Griffith, Executive Director of the Curriculum Commission.

Ms. Griffith highlighted the Governor's education initiatives included in his budget proposal for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Highlights of the Governor's proposed budget include the following:

An increase in per-pupil spending, fully funded COLAs and growth for all K-12 programs, strong emphasis in teacher recruitment and training and professional development, increase in support to students needing help to meet standards, student incentives for achievement, and a public awareness campaign to be conducted by the State Board regarding accountability and school reform. In addition, additional discretionary funds for K-12 may become available through the May Revise phase of the budget development.

Ms. Griffith reported that the CFIR office would be impacted in a positive manner by the Governor's proposal since the five temporary positions added previously to implement AB 2519 are proposed to be permanent positions in the CDE budget. The Governor is proposing that Goals 2000 funding be allocated to support the distribution of the frameworks next year.

Ms. Griffith introduced Barbara Jeffus, CDE Consultant for School Libraries, who shared her delight that for the third consecutive year significant funds are included in the state budget for school and classroom libraries. Ms. Jeffus shared that the Governor has proposed two new CDE staff positions for library support. Discussion ensued regarding the \$125 million funding for K-4 classroom libraries. Ms. Astore stated concern that 1500 paperbacks are needed in each classroom to ensure adequate opportunities for students to independently read across the grade spans. Ken Dotson moved to recommend to the State Board that SBE pursue a legislative augmentation to expand funding to increase the grade span for classroom libraries from K-4 to K-12, at the same rate of funding per grade level. Ms. Abarca seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Griffith also reported on the posting of the Academic Performance Index (API). The Office of Policy and Evaluation will provide a thorough briefing for the Commission in March. At this time the API is based on assessments, but will evolve to include other indicators. The Governor also proposed funding to improve the data collection process for the other indicators.

Regarding the Governor's budget proposal, Ms. Joseph noted that the professional development within the Governor's budget in support of Algebra would start with seventh grade teachers.

Ms. Griffith gave a brief summary of the High School Exit Exam and offered to provide additional resources about the Exam. Ms. Griffith also indicated that the CDE Standards and Assessment Division would provide an update on the writing assessment during the ELA/ELD Subject Matter Committee.

The CFIR Division is developing a plan for a special statewide teleconference briefing for districts regarding funding sources for instructional materials. She announced that the Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics Frameworks are now downloadable from the Department of Education website (http://www.cde.ca.gov/cilbranch/cc) and production of a compact disc version of each framework

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

document is being considered. In addition, the CFIR work plan includes extended outreach to districts to expand awareness of the curriculum frameworks. Ms. Leslie Schwartz suggested that school board presidents be included in all invitations to such outreach opportunities. Ms. Norris asked that school sites also know about funding for instructional resources. Ms. Astore noted the value of the annotated lists of adopted materials, which are now available on the CDE website.

E. Report of the State Board of Education Liaison.

Board Liaison Marion Joseph affirmed the content of Chair Astore's report of the recent actions by the State Board related to the Commission. She asked for confirmation that complementary frameworks were distributed to the districts. Ms. Stickel indicated that schools in her district had received the frameworks and were appreciative.

She reminded the Commissioners and staff that it was decided that the <u>California Reading Initiative and Special Education</u> document is to be included with each copy of the framework. The SBE was pleased with the criteria for the 2002 ELA/ELD adoption and the scheduled February 11 briefing meeting for publishers. She also indicated that the Board is looking forward to receiving the Science 2000 Adoption recommendations from the Commission.

Ms. Joseph described the Governor's effort to connect AB 2519 adoptions with the California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP). She reported that the CSMP was directed to connect the reading and math training to the adopted standards-based aligned materials purchased. There will be priority for districts to receive training support through the Subject Matter Projects about the specific materials in an effort to move away from generic training.

Mr. Dotson asked that the Board keep in mind the need for early professional support for year-round schools. Ms. Stickel asked that mathematics be emphasized equally. Ms. Joseph also shared the concern for support for professional development related to math.

Ms. Astore requested that Ms. Joseph provide advice on how to influence proposals for professional development incentives, which create competing stipend offerings for teachers. Ms. Joseph suggested the Chair bring forth in a future report to the SBE a request for board discussion about the advantages for enhancing or augmenting existing stipends for teachers, rather than creating competing offerings.

Ms. Astore introduced Deputy Superintendent Hernandez to the Commission and introduced the four new Commissioners Norris, Coronado, Griffin, and Yamamoto. Ms. Hernandez thanked the Commissioners for their tremendous efforts. She spoke of the Department's ongoing commitment to try to build up the capacity of the CFIR staff to support what is needed to continue the valuable work of the Commission.

- F. <u>Correspondence/Requests from the State Board of Education (SBE)</u> Chair Astore said that John Mockler, Executive Director, SBE, waived his time during this meeting.
- G. <u>Approval of Minutes of Minutes of the November 1999 Meeting</u>. Ms. Yamamoto requested a spelling correction of a name (p. 27); Sue Stickel moved that the minutes be approved with the correction; Roy Anthony seconded the motion; the vote of "ayes" was unanimous.
- H. <u>Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) Briefing</u>: Conflicts of Interests, Wayne Imberi, FPPC Representative

Ms. Griffith introduced Wayne Imberi and Janette Truvill from the FPPC. Mr. Imberi, Consultant, provided background on the Political Reform Act which requires public officials who are designated in the code as obligated to file conflict of interest statements and statements of economic interest. He provided detailed support to the Commissioners regarding conflicts of interest, which may relate to situations confronted by the Commissioners. He encouraged the Commissioners to call the Fair Political Practices Commission regarding concerns that may occur during their tenure.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

I. Other Matters/ Audience Comment. No comments came from the audience. Commission Chair Astore recessed the full commission at 11:25 a.m. She recommended that all Commissioners be present to listen to the Executive committee's meeting.

2. Executive Committee.

Present: Marilyn Astore, Chair; Patty Abarca, Vice Chair; Sue Stickel, Catherine Banker, Ken Dotson CFIR Staff: Sherry Skelly Griffin, Executive Director

A. Seating Arrangements during Subject Matter Committees.

Executive Committee member Sue Stickel recommended continuation of the prior practice of using the name plates as indicators of subcommittee membership for each part of the agenda while all other commission members would remain seated to the extent possible. The Executive Committee approved by consensus to have the SMC members meet on the dais throughout the Commission agenda.

B. <u>Approval for Travel Expenditures – Process</u> - (Information)

Ms. Griffith provided an update for the committee regarding the approval process for travel outside of regular commission meetings. The process includes bringing requests to the full Commission whenever possible; and, in the interim, the request must be approved by the Chair and submitted to CDE/CFIR for review and final approval.

C. AB 116 (Mazzoni): Legal and Social Compliance - (State Board Action/Update)

Ms. Griffith provided an update of the State Board's action regarding the implementation of guidelines for the prohibition against unnecessary advertising in instructional materials. The guidelines approved were part of the Commission agenda packets.

D. <u>Commission Policies/Review by Executive Committee</u> - (Information/Action)

The Executive Committee agreed by consensus that the Executive Committee will first address issues, which affect the full Commission.

E. <u>Adoption Timelines – change/correction process</u> (Discussion/Action)

Ms. Stickel asked that the Executive Committee make time to define corrections/edits/ changes on the March Agenda to ensure the Math Adoption provides appropriate direction to the publishers. After considerable discussion, a motion was passed by the Executive Committee to recommended that the SBE adopt revised timelines for Mathematics and ELA/ELD to allow SBE to act on the adoptions in January of 2001 and 2002 respectively.

Relative to the issue of the adoption timeline, the Executive Committee also directed staff to put on the March agenda the topic of who should vote in upcoming adoptions. Commissioner Astore adjourned the Executive Committee at 12:30 p.m.

LUNCH BREAK – 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Full Commission (Reconvenes)

3. Science 2000 Adoption – Full Commission

Commissioner Marilyn Astore, Chair, reconvened the full commission at 1:30 p.m., January 20, 2000 to act on the 2000 Science Adoption. The Commissioners present and absent were the same identified in the minutes for the morning session of the full commission.

A. Report of proposed final recommendations (Information)

Chair Astore informed the Commissioners that CFIR staff would give an overview on the adoption process and change process for the benefit of new commissioners. In addition, she stated that Commissioner

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Schwartz, Dr. Otto, and she would give individual reports of the January 8 meeting. Chair Astore recognized Sherry Griffith, Executive Director of the Curriculum Commission.

Ms. Griffith stated this adoption was done under the authority of AB2519, which put in place legislation stating:

The schedule for the adoption of instructional materials requires . . . instructional materials for science to be adopted by March 31, 2000,

The State Board of Education approves criteria for the adoption of instructional materials in science at least 12 months before the board adopts instructional materials in science.

Ms. Griffith noted that this adoption was based on criteria adopted by the SBE on March 10, 1999 and the Academic Content Standards for Science adopted by the SBE in October 1998. She also pointed out that the criteria, which were brought before the SBE by the Curriculum Commission, have five elements:

- (1) <u>Science Content/Alignment with Standards</u>: the content as specified in the California Science Standards.
- (2) <u>Program Organization:</u> the sequence and organization of the science program.
- (3) <u>Assessment</u>: the strategies presented in the instructional materials for measuring what students know and are able to do.
- (4) <u>Universal Access:</u> the information and ideas that address the needs of special student populations, including students eligible for special education, advanced students, students whose English language proficiency is significantly lower than that typical of the class or grade level, and students whose achievement is either significantly below or significantly above that typical of the class or grade level.
- (5) <u>Instructional Planning and Support:</u> the instructional planning and support information and materials, typically including a separate edition specially designed for use by the teacher, that assist teachers in the implementation of the science program.

Ms. Griffith noted that this adoption involved two panels of reviewers. One panel was the Content Review Panel (CRP) which was composed of 14 members who were scientists with Ph.D. in scientific fields. The Content Review Panel members reviewed materials according to their specialty as related to the strands of earth, life, and physical, and included those investigations and experiments relevant to their specialty. Scientists were from the California State University, University of California, private universities, and even from the University of Wisconsin system. The CRP reviewed materials according to Criterion One: Science Content/Alignment with Standards; the content as specified in the California Science Standards.

Ms. Griffith spoke about the Instructional Materials Advisory Panels (IMAPs) which consisted of 52 members with the overwhelming majority being classroom teachers. The panels included administrators, school board members, and parents. There were six separate groups with grade-level emphasis--three elementary and three middle schools. The IMAP reviewed programs according to all five categories:

- (1) Science Content/Alignment with Standards
- (2) Program Organization
- (3) Assessment
- (4) Universal Access
- (5) Instructional Planning and Support.

Ms. Griffith reviewed the change process. At their November meeting, the Commission voted to have the Science Content Review Panel review the proposed changes by publishers. The Commission put programs into category 1, having met the standards but requiring corrections, and category 2, having not been recommended but could be reconsidered. Two publishers in category 2, Globe Fearon and Scott Foresman, withdrew from the change process. The only publisher in category 2 to submit changes was SRA/McGraw-Hill.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Ms. Griffith noted the requirements which publishers had to meet in submitting changes. Publishers submitted proposed changes by December 20 to the Curriculum Commissioners, CDE, and designated Content Review Panel members. Publishers in category 1 directly addressed the corrections that were explicit in the IMAP and/or CRP reports. Publishers in category 2 brought forward their proposed changes to bring their program into alignment with the standards. Publishers in category 2 had to submit a new standards map to indicate where their program met the standards and what changes had been made.

Ms. Griffith then discussed the process of CRP review. After publishers sent their materials, CRP members reviewed the proposed changes according to their specialty, life, physical, or earth. For programs in category 1, CRP members verified that the specified changes have been made correctly. For programs in category 2, the publisher had to prove that the changes align the program with the standards. CRP members submitted their evaluation of the proposed changes.

Ms. Griffith restated the rules of contact, as publishers were reminded not to contact CRP members. In addition, publishers were requested not to ask Department staff as to the appropriateness of changes.

Chair Astore then asked Tom Adams of CFIR to review the proceeding and outcomes of the meeting on January 8, 2000, involving the Review Panel of Marilyn Astore, Richard Schwartz, Rollie Otto and the publishers.

Dr. Adams noted that the Review Panel consisted of Marilyn Astore, Richard Schwartz and Dr. Rollie Otto, and its role was to examine the CRP reviews of the publishers' proposed changes. When the CRP reviews came to the California Department of Education, they were sent to the Review Panel and to publishers. Both publishers and the Review Panel saw the submitted reviews prior to January 8. The format consisted of meeting with each publisher individually. Each publisher presented their response to the CRP reviews and Panel members discussed with publishers the response. The Review Panel then deliberated on the proposed changes and informed the publisher of the decision of the Panel. Dr. Adams noted that all decisions by the Review Panel were reached by consensus and that there were no dissenting opinions.

Dr. Adams summarized the recommendations from Review Panel and asked Commissioners to examine the table titled: "Summary of Recommendations from Change Process." He pointed out that the chart notes the CRP reviews, Curriculum Commission Action on Nov. 16-17, and the recommendations of the Review Panel from January 8. He also stated that some CRP members did not submit reports because of other obligations.

Summary of 2000 Science Recommendations from "Change Process"

Publisher &	Grade	CRP Earth	CRP	CRP Life	Curric.	Review Panel—
Program	levels		Physical		Comm.	Astore, Otto
					11/16/99	Schwartz
Glencoe: Glencoe	6-8	James Shea:	Susana	Jennifer Matos:	Category	Yes
Science Voyages		Yes.	Deustua:	Yes with some	1	
			Yes	concerns		
Harcourt Brace:	K-5	Douglas	Adrian	Kevin Padian:	Category	Yes
Harcourt Science		Hammond:	Herzog:	Inadequate	1	
		Yes with	No report	changes		
		some				
		concerns				
Holt, Rinehart,	6-8	Douglas	Susana	Carol Balfe:	Category	Yes
Winston: Holt		Hammond:	Deustua:	Yes with	1	
Science and		Yes with	Yes with	concerns		
Technology,		concerns	concerns			
Earth, Life and						
Physical Science						
Houghton-	K-5	Mark	Charles	Margaret Clark:	Category	Yes

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Mifflin:		Zoback:	Munger:	Yes with some	1	
Discovery Works		Yes	No report	concerns		
McGraw-Hill	K-6	David	Joseph	Jennifer Matos:	Category	Yes
		Sigurdson:	Chang:	Yes with some	1	
		Yes with	Yes with	concerns		
		some	some			
		concerns	concerns			
Prentice Hall:	6-8	James Shea:	Adrian	Carol Balfe:	Category	Yes
Science Explorer		Yes but	Herzog:	Yes but some	1	
		some	No report.	concerns		
		concerns				
SRA/McGraw-	K-6	Mark	Charles	Margaret Clark:	Category	No
Hill		Zoback:	Munger:	No	2	
		Yes	No report			

DROPPED OUT OF CHANGE PROCESS:

Scott Foresman, Scott Foresman Science, K-5

Globe Fearon, Concepts and Challenges in Earth, Life, and Physical Sciences, 6-8

Dr. Adams elaborated on publisher requirements for delivery of changes. At the meeting, publishers were instructed to submit proof of the agreed upon changes by January 18 to the Review Panel and the CDE. Publisher also had to ship changes to the LRDCs 30 days before SBE action. The agreed upon changes must appear in the materials and final copies must be delivered to CDE and the LRDCs no longer than 90 days after SBE action. Any extensions would have to be approved by CDE.

Chair Astore thanked staff for summarizing all these issues. She also thanked all those involved in the adoption—scientists, teachers, parents, and administrators--both those involved in the process and those who gave release time to teachers. She noted that she was impressed with the cooperation of publishers and grateful that they were willing to bring their programs into alignment with the standards and improve the accuracy of materials. She stated that California is in the midst of a great change in instructional materials with the greatest concerns being content and accuracy. Chair Astore then called upon Dr. Rollie Otto and Richard Schwartz to give their individual reports from the January 8 meeting. She asked Dr. Otto to discuss the important issue regarding scientific fact and interpretation.

Dr. Rollie Otto thanked Chair Astore for pointing out an important issue, the difference between scientific fact and interpretation. He noted that working on this adoption were many of the finest scientists from the University of California, Stanford, University of Southern California, and the California State University. He noted that the members of CRP provided their best professional judgment of scientific facts and issues. In some cases, this was simply a question of correct wording. In other cases, instructional materials and CRPs disagree over scientific interpretation, for example, on the definition of heat and biological classification systems. In these cases, the Review Panel asked the publisher to provide the scientific basis for their use of an approach. The panel asked for a scientific justification for their choice of material.

Dr. Otto stated that his review of the January 8 changes is that the publishers have done all that was agreed upon at that meeting.

Marilyn Astore thanked Dr. Otto and asked Commissioner Schwartz to speak about the January 8 meeting and give his review of the publisher changes. Commissioner Schwartz thanked all those involved in the science adoption. He stated that the recommended materials are a great leap forward and will put good science materials in the hands of children. He stated that the publishers have done all that was agreed upon at that meeting.

B. Audience Comment. Chair Astore asked for audience comment. There were two speakers.

Joseph Mastropaolo, Emeritus Professor, CSU Long Beach, commented on the need for accurate and full explanations of evolution in instructional materials.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Leonard Tramiel, Ph.D. astrophysics, spoke on the need for factual accuracy and the shortcomings of the CRP. He asked that none of the recommended materials be approved.

After public comment, there was discussion about the merits of the process and the work of the Content Review Panel. Commissioner Anthony called for the vote on the recommendations.

C. Final Commission Recommendations on 2000 Science Adoption (Action)

Chair Astore reminded Commissioners that the Commission does not entertain negative resolutions. She stated that if the program is not recommended, the resolution still needs to be stated in a positive manner (to recommend) and then the resolution fails to win the necessary votes. She noted there would be a roll call vote for every program except those in category 3. Chair Astore stated that Commissioner Schwartz will make the motion and then someone must second the motion. She reminded Commissioners that these would be roll call votes.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Glencoe</u>, <u>Glencoe Science Voyages</u>, <u>grades 6-8</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Stickel seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Harcourt Brace</u>, <u>Harcourt Science</u>, <u>grade K-5</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Holt, Rinehart, Winston, Holt Science and Technology, Earth, Life, and Physical Science, grades 6-8</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Houghton-Mifflin: Discovery Works, grades K-5</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>McGraw-Hill, McGraw Hill Science, grades K-6</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Dotson seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Prentice Hall, Science Explorer, grades 6-8</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 yes and 4 absent. The motion passed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>SRA/McGraw-Hill, SRA Science, K-6</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 2 yes (Banker and Coronado), 10 no and 4 absent. The motion failed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend Globe <u>Fearon: Concepts and Challenges in Earth, Life and Physical Sciences, grades 6-8</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 no and 4 absent. The motion failed.

Commissioner Schwartz moved to recommend <u>Scott Foresman, Scott Foresman Science, grades K-5</u> to the State Board of Education for adoption. Commissioner Abarca seconded the motion. Vote: 12 no and 4 absent. The motion failed.

 Other Matters/Audience Comment. There were no other matters and the meeting of the full commission was recessed for a short break.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

At 4:15, after a short break in proceedings, Chair Astore reconvened the full commission and proposed the option of skipping forward to the Visual and Performing Arts Committee next.

3. Visual and Performing Arts Subject Matter Committee

Present: Roy Anthony, Chair; Karen Yamamoto, Vice Chair; Mary Coronado, Lora Griffin, Sue Stickel

Absent: Janet Philibosian

Staff: Suzanne Rios, Sherry Griffith

A. Future Adoption Timeline Issues - (Information)

Mr. Anthony requested staff review limited availability of Commissioners to attend various adoption activities, which may result from the timing of deliberations for the next VPA adoption and its overlap with another adoption.

B. Update on Summit Meeting/Arts Task Force - (Information)

Mr. Anthony had no further information to relate other than ongoing interest in the CSU and UC discussion about agreements for an entrance requirement in visual or performing arts.

C. Other Matters/Audience Comment. No other issues were presented.

4. Mathematics Subject Matter Committee

Present: Sue Stickel, Chair; Catherine Banker, Veronica Norris, Richard Schwartz, Leslie Schwarze

Absent: Vik Hovsepian, Vice Chair; Barbara Smith

Staff: Lily Roberts, Consultant, CFIR; Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, CFIR

Chair Stickel called to order the Mathematics Subject Matter Committee at 4:25 p.m. and then introduced Dr. Lily Roberts as the interim consultant for the math adoption. Chair Stickel recommended that the Committee table Item 4C until the March meeting. Item 4D, the math timeline, was covered before Item 4A.

D. Math Timeline related to the change/correction process.

Chair Stickel noted the Executive Committee addressed the revised timeline and change process issue. The timeline was modified to meet a request from the State Board of Education to move up the date for Board action to January 2001. There will be further resolution on the definition of the change process at the March Commission meeting.

A. Update on 2001 Math Adoption/Invitation to Submit (ITS)

Chair Stickel reported that the Invitation to Submit (ITS) meeting is scheduled for March 15 from 1-4 p.m. in the State Library, Room 500. Chair Stickel indicated that she will be present at the ITS meeting. She asked the Committee members if they were comfortable with the revised timeline going forward with the ITS. A motion was put forward by Commissioner Schwarze and seconded by Commissioner Banker to approve the revised math timeline dated 1-13-00. All Committee members present approved the motion.

Chair Stickel noted that the main task for the Committee today was to review and select the IMAP and CRP Panelists to be recommended to the Full Commission to forward to the State Board for approval. Eighty-nine (89) applications were received. The applications were sent to the Committee prior to the meeting for their review.

B. IMAP/CRP Applicants

Chair Stickel began by addressing the list of applicants to serve on the Instructional Materials Advisory Panel (IMAP) and Content Review Panel (CRP) who noted a potential conflict of interest. Suzanne Rios made a brief report on her follow-up calls to each applicant who had made such a note, and a copy of her findings was

 $\label{local-condition} C:\operatorname{Program Files}\A dobe\A crobat\4.0\A crobat\plug_ins\OpenAll\Transform\temp\cc1-2000minutes.dftF.doc;\ 03/07/00$

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

distributed to the Committee. Only one applicant (ID #62) was found to have a conflict of interest and was disqualified from further consideration.

The Committee began with the selection of CRP applicants. The Committee agreed that only individuals with a Ph.D. in Mathematics would be considered for the CRP. The Committee went through the list of eligible CRP applicants before recording their selections either voicing concerns or support before voting. As needed, the Committee referred to the applicants' applications for further clarification. Commissioners recorded their "Yes" votes on a chart prepared by staff. Twelve of the applicants were selected as CRPs to be recommended to the Full Commission.

Those applicants that indicated that they would be either IMAP or CRP and who were not selected for the CRP were added to the list of IMAP-only applicants. The same process was followed as with the CRPs, except the "No" votes were recorded on the IMAP chart prepared by staff. Then each applicant that had at least one "No" vote was discussed and consensus was reached on each applicant as to whether to reject or maintain the applicant on the IMAP list.

The motion was tabled until Friday, so that staff could identify the demographics of the applicants selected, because the final panel needs to have at least 50% K-8 classroom teachers (also see Item J (2).).

4B. Mathematics Subject Matter Committee, Continued on Friday January 21, 2000

On Friday, the Committee took action on the CRP and IMAP panelist nominees to be forwarded to the Commission for recommendation to the State Board of Education in February. The motion was approved unanimously. The staff was directed to open up a search for additional CRP and IMAP alternates. The roster represents 54 finalists, less than the original goal of 60 panelists; so the SMC agreed to move to the Commission a plan to recruit for a pool of six (6) to ten (10) alternates for review and approval in March.

The following report was prepared by staff and shared with the Math Subject Matter Committee on January 21, 2000, during their working lunch. The Math SMC voted to approve the list (identified by application number) for recommendation to the full Commission. (See Item J for Full Commission approval.)

SELECTION OF THE CRP/IMAP MEMBERS FOR THE 2001 MATHEMATICS ADOPTION:

The Math Subject Matter Committee reviewed eighty-nine (89) applicants for Content Review Panelist (CRP) or Instructional Material Advisory Panelist (IMAP). The Committee selected twelve (12) CRP applicants for Commission approval and nomination to the State Board. The main criterion for the CRP selection was a Ph.D. in Mathematics. Fifty-four (54) applicants were selected to serve as IMAP members. The following is a brief overview of the selected applicants:

Content Review Panel (CRP), 12 Panelists:

University Affiliation:

- 5 University of California
- 4 California State University
- 3 Private Higher Education Institution (Stanford)

Geographic Representation:

- 6 Southern
- 2 Northern
- 4 Bay

Gender:

- 10 Male
- 2 Female

<u>Instructional Material Advisory Panel (IMAP)</u>, 54 Panelists:

<u>Professional Representation:</u>

- Teachers (8 Specialists); this represents a total of 36 classroom teachers)
- 5 Administrators

 $\label{lem:condition} C:\operatorname{Program Files}\A dobe\A crobat\4.0\A crobat\plug_ins\OpenAll\Transform\temp\cc1-2000minutes.dftF.doc;\ 03/07/00$

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

- 1 Local School Board Trustee
- 1 Researcher
- 3 Higher Education Instructors
- 1 Retired Engineer (Aerospace)
 - Software Executive

Geographic Representation:

- 30 Southern
- 12 Northern
- 4 Central
- 8 Bay

Gender:

- 15 Male
- 39 Female
- E. Other Matters/Audience Comment (Continuation of SMC meeting on Thursday, January 20). After the selection of IMAP and CRP members, Chair Stickel asked if there were any questions from other Commissioners or the audience. There were no comments and the Mathematics SMC meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

6. Science Subject Matter Committee

Present: Richard Schwartz, Chair; Catherine Banker, Vice Chair; Ken Dotson, Veronica Norris

Absent: Joe Nation, Barbara Smith

Staff: Rona Gordon, Lily Roberts, Terry Emmett

Chair Richard Schwartz convened the Science Subject Matter Committee at approximately 6:00 p.m.

- A. Status of work on the Science Framework: Terry Emmett, Administrator, Curriculum Frameworks Office, provided an update. The Framework is moving forward as expected. The Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee (CFCC) at its meeting January 27-28, 2000 will review a new draft. Terry distributed copies to the members of the Subject Matter Committee. Rollie Otto, the framework writer, added that the Table of Contents has been revised to conform to the Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics frameworks. The CFCC will review the framework again in February, and it will be presented to the Subject Matter Committee in March to recommend to the Curriculum Commission for approval and field-testing.
- B. Science Testing (grades 9-12) Request from State Board of Education. Sherry Griffith, Executive Director of the Curriculum Commission, summarized the request from the State Board of Education to provide input on the development of an augmented STAR test for science in grades 9-12. The Board acted in January to meet the deadline required for field-testing. Marilyn Astore, Chair of the Curriculum Commission, Marion Bergeson, State Board liaison, Rick Schwartz, Chair of the Science SMC, Mike Rios, Chair of the Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee (CFCC), and Dr. Rollie Otto participated in developing the testing recommendations.
 - Dr. Otto reviewed the background and rationale for the proposed recommendations. The high school science standards cover four disciplines chemistry, physics, biology, and earth science, and a strand for investigation and experimentation (I&E). The Standards Commission deliberately did not prescribe how the standards should be taught. There are two common modes of science instruction in high school: discipline-based, or integrated/coordinated theme-based courses. The recommendations approved by the SBE call for the development of eight tests four in the discipline areas, and four integrated/coordinated tests. All tests will include the I&E standards to encourage laboratory-based science courses. Every student should have the opportunity to take courses that meet UC/CSU requirements that are standards and laboratory-based.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

A data bank of items is currently being field-tested. A panel of experts, drawing on items from the four disciplines will design the four integrated/coordinated tests. A group of experienced teachers will be convened to recommend which standards sets should be compiled for the four tests. They will not necessarily be hierarchical. Districts will determine what tests to give to students based on the courses they are enrolled in. Students must have the opportunity to learn the material on which they will be tested. Rollie reported that he would provide a recommended list of experts to Sherry Griffith and Terry Emmett, with input from the CFCC. The CDE will refine the list and establish an informal panel to assist the State Board in working with Harcourt Educational Measurement to develop the integrated/coordinated tests, using currently field-tested items. Several commissioners emphasized the need for teachers to have the information about what will be tested as quickly as possible. The augmented tests will be administered statewide in spring 2001 to students who are enrolled in standards-based science courses.

- C. Follow-up Adoption and Timelines. The Committee did not discuss this matter at this time.
- D. Other Matters/Audience Comment. Commissioner Schwartz asked for comments from the subject matter committee or the full commission. Then an audience member, Dr. Joseph Mastropaolo, CSU Long Beach, Emeritus Professor, discussed his views on the general treatment of evolution in the science standards, framework and instructional materials. The commissioners invited him to review the recently approved science instructional materials at the Learning Resource Display Center located at the Orange County Office of Education. Ms. Astore encouraged him to provide comments directly to the Department of Education and to the State Board of Education. Mr. Schwartz adjourned the Science Committee at 6:30 p.m. and then Chair Astore recessed the full commission for the day.

Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair

Joseph Nation

Mary Coronado Calvario

Lora L. Griffin

Susan Stickel

Richard Schwartz

Full Commission, Friday, January 21, 2000

<u>Curriculum Commissioners--Present</u>:

Marilyn Astore, Chair (absent the first hour of January 21)

Catherine Banker Ken Dotson Veronica N. Norris Leslie Schwarze

Karen S. Yamamoto

Commissioners--Absent:

Roy Anthony Viken Hovsepian Janet Philibosian Barbara Smith

Dede Alpert, Member of the Senate

Jack Scott, Member of the Assembly

State Board of Education Liaison--Absent

Marion Joseph

California Department of Education Staff:

Sherry Skelly Griffith, Exec. Director, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Div.

Terry Emmett, Administrator, CFIR Suzanne Rios, Acting Administrator, CFIR

Sandi Adams-Jones, Staff Service Manager, CFIR
Nancy Brynelson, Consultant, CFIR
Beverly Cole, Office Technician, CFIR
Anna Emery, AGP Analyst, CFIR
Deborah Keys, Consultant, CFIR

Standard Ross, Techny Ross, Consultant, CFIR

Thomas Adams, Consultant, CFIR

Judith Brown, Consultant, CFIR

Miguel Cordova, AGP Analyst, CFIR

Rona Gordon, Consultant, CFIR

Lily Roberts, Consultant, CFIR

Sonia Hernandez, Deputy Superintendent, Curriculum and Instructional Leadership Branch, CDE

At 8:00 a.m., Commission Vice Chair Abarca called the full commission to order and welcomed the audience and the Commissioners back to the meeting. She thanked everyone for the late evening work on Thursday.

 $\label{lem:condition} C:\operatorname{Program Files}\A dobe\A crobat\4.0\A crobat\plug_ins\OpenAll\Transform\temp\cc1-2000minutes.dftF.doc;\ 03/07/00$

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

7. Health Subject Matter Committee – January 21, 2000

Present: Veronica Norris, Chair; Lora Griffin, Vice Chair; Richard Schwartz

Absent: Roy Anthony

Staff: Rona Gordon, CFIR; Caroline Roberts, Administrator, CDE School Health Connections

Guest: Dr. Deborah Wood, Director, California Healthy Kids Resource Center

A. Healthy Schools, Healthy People Conference - (Information).

Veronica Norris convened the Health Subject Matter Committee at 8:10 a.m. Caroline Roberts, Administrator, School Health Connections Office, provided a report on the recent conference. She summarized the main points of one of the keynote speakers, Lisbeth Schorr, who gave a presentation on characteristics of effective health-related programs in schools, the need for systems change and reforms, and the need to look at outcomes for children. Caroline stated that the breakout sessions presented programs and strategies that are working in schools. The conference attracts a diverse professional group and is a good opportunity for making connections and exploring issues related to student health.

- B. <u>Framework Update</u>. Rona Gordon, Consultant in the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, provided an update on the status of the Health Framework addendum. Staff is working within CDE and with the field to identify writers for the 17 topic areas. A preliminary contact has been made with a potential overall writer. The scope and content of the sections are also being defined. At the next meeting, a clearly identified list of contributors and outlines of the content of the sections will be available, and work should be underway with the writer.
- C. Speaker: Dr. Deborah Wood, Director, California Healthy Kids Resource Center. Caroline Roberts introduced Dr. Wood, Director of the Healthy Kids Resource Center based at the Alameda County Office of Education. The Center is supported by several CDE programs and funding sources, and is one of the best resources for children's health in California. Dr. Wood presented a live demonstration of the Healthy Kids Resource Center web site. A major function of the center is to provide reviewed, high quality instructional health-related materials for use in California public schools. The web site facilitates access to these materials for teachers, school nurses and others. Teachers are moving in the direction of Internet use, and loaning materials is a big part of the work the Center does.

Dr. Wood described the materials review process, which is conducted by a 40-member review board. Publishers, teachers, student teachers, and school districts all utilize the criteria used to review these materials. The review has a health focus on the kinds of things that have demonstrated effectiveness in influencing students' health behaviors. Research is validated by the Centers for Disease Control. Users may construct a loan list and submit their orders electronically. The only cost to users is that of return shipping. State adopted materials can be easily identified by a keyword search.

Veronica asked about the linking of health materials to academic content standards. A discussion took place concerning the development of lesson plans, specifically on HIV prevention, that links mandated AIDS instruction with core literature and language arts standards. Some concern was expressed by Commissioners regarding the need to focus on AIDS instruction, the adequacy of addressing academic content standards through health education, and ensuring parental notification and involvement in family life education topics. Health educators and language arts specialists are developing this curriculum, which will be sent out for pilot testing and review. Dr. Wood mentioned that significant funding is provided for HIV prevention education and it is a priority. The lesson plans linked to literature involve themes such as decision-making, tolerance and dealing with loss. Caroline Roberts reiterated that the Department explicitly upholds parental rights and responsibilities to review health education materials and absolutely does not support a "back door" approach to family life education.

Dr. Wood also described the web site section on school health laws and another section that provides links to reviewed, high quality health related resources.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

At the conclusion of the presentation, Commissioner Schwarze raised a question regarding the Healthy Kids survey, which is also found on the Healthy Kids Resource Center web site. She expressed concerns about the nature and appropriateness of questions in some of the optional survey modules. She stated that the burden is placed on families to research the nature of the specific questions. Caroline Roberts responded that the survey is based on a CDC national instrument used to assess youth behavior. At the next Commission meeting, an expert on the Healthy Kids Survey can address these issues.

Veronica Norris and other Commissioners thanked Dr. Wood for her excellent presentation. Dr. Wood expressed appreciation for their interest and concern regarding health education. The Health Subject Matter Committee was adjourned at approximately 9:05 a.m.

8. English Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee, January 21, 2000

Present: Patty Abarca, Chair; Mary Coronado, Ken Dotson, Lora Griffin, Karen Yamamoto,

Leslie Schwarze

Absent: Janet Philibosian, Vice Chair

Staff: Deborah Keys, Nancy Brynelson, Consultants;

Gwen Stephens, Director, Standards and Assessment Division

A. 2002 Reading/English Language Arts Criteria.

Chair Abarca reiterated that the SBE approved the criteria on December 8, 1999, and SBE President Trigg, the Board Liaison, and State Superintendent Eastin approved subsequent edits on December 21, 1999. Additional minor edits, requested by Board Liaison Marion Joseph, were made to the criteria after December 21, 1999. These edits were made to provide consistency throughout the criteria. The edits consisted of changing terminology such as "letter-sound correspondences" to "sound-spelling" and "sight vocabulary" to "high frequency." The criteria was finalized and approved as of January 13, 2000. Commissioner Dotson pointed out that on line 140 of the criteria, "grammatically correct" is redundant. Chair Abarca said she preferred that particular line remain.

Guest Speaker, Gwen Stephens, Director of the Standards and Assessments Division, gave an update of the development of the STAR Writing Prompts.

B. Framework and Criteria Briefing for Publishers

Chair Abarca noted that the Commission and the Department will sponsor a Publishers Briefing for the ELA/ELD K-8 Adoption Criteria. This briefing will be held on Friday, February 11, 2000, 8:30 a.m.-5:00 p.m. at 714 P Street, Room 102, Sacramento, CA. She also noted that a planning meeting to prepare for the briefing would be held on Wednesday, February 2, 2000; however, that meeting will not be publicly noted. The speakers for the briefing on February 11th will include Board Member Liaison Marion Joseph, Chair Abarca, Commissioner and Chair Astore, Commissioner Schwarze, Alice Furry for the Sacramento County Office of Education, Karen Hayashi, Elk Grove Unified School District and CDE Staff. Chair Abarca strongly encouraged publishers to submit questions for the briefing. She also encouraged all Commissioners to attend the briefing. Chair Abarca noted that the questions submitted by publishers ahead of time would remain anonymous. Sherry Griffith stated that the questions publishers submit early would be used to frame the briefing.

C. Adoption Timeline.

The 2002 ELA/ELD K-8 Adoption Timeline was covered in the Executive Committee.

D. CRP/IMAP Application Process

Chair Abarca asked that the SMC make a study soon of the features of the CRP/IMAP application used for recent adoptions. Commissioner Dotson asked if there could be any way that the CRP/IMAP application

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

be streamlined for the 2002 Adoption for the people who previously served on the AB 2519 Adoption. Commissioner Stickel said the Math SMC reviewed applications from the AB 2519 Adoption for their 2001 CRP/IMAP recruitment process, but the applicants had not referred to the new framework. She thought that was a concern to keep in mind. Chair Abarca proposed a look at the AB 2519 applicants for the 2002 adoption. Commissioner Yamamoto requested that a clear description of required meetings and mailings be included on the application.

Tom Adams reminded the Commission about conflict of interest information that may come into play with new applicants, so there is a need to re-screen all new IMAP/CRP applicants.

Sherry Griffith stated that the SMC may want to look at applicants for specialized areas such as Special Education and other specific areas outlined in the criteria. Chair Abarca did not think CRP's would be that difficult to recruit, but getting Social Science and Science applicants might be more difficult.

Chair Abarca asked that the AB 2519 CRP/IMAP application be sent to SMC members ahead of time, and that the application process be placed on the next SMC agenda for discussion.

Chair Abarca thanked the Language Arts SMC for their diligent work. She stated that the SMC had five meetings during the November Commission meeting. She suggested that perhaps other SMC's might want to use shorter meetings as opposed to the very long SMC meeting format held by some SMC's. Commissioner Banker reminded Chair Abarca that many Commissioners had other meetings they had to work with and additional meetings would not work for them.

E. <u>Distribution of California Reading Initiative</u>

Chair Astore brought materials to share with the Commissioners from the State Resource Center, which is funded to find research-based material to the field. She had received special permission to give the Commissioners the materials (\$65 value) because of the importance of the research collection. She stated that Read All About It! is so popular that it is being used in teacher preparation classes. The Guide to the California Reading Initiative and Learning to Read K-8 were also distributed to the Commissioners. Commissioner Coronado added that she was using one of the documents in her reading class at UC-Davis; and the graduate students think it is wonderful. Commissioner Astore also encouraged all publishers to read these documents (available for purchase from the Reading Alliance Project Center, Sacramento County Office of Education, 916-228-2425, c/o Jill Relles).

Chair Abarca stated that the Special Education Reading Task Force document, The California Reading Initiative and Special Education in California: Critical Ideas Focusing on Meaningful Reform was presented at the November Commission Meeting by Beth Rice and Board Liaison Marion Joseph. She stated that the SMC took action to make this document an addendum to the framework. However, she stated that she was informed that this is not a SBE adopted document and really should not be included in the framework. Deborah Keys agreed with Chair Abarca but stated that the document would be sent out as a separate document with the framework.

Sherry Griffith updated the SMC regarding this matter and stated that the SBE did approve the document to be sent out with each framework. She stated that the staff was working on a letter from President Trigg and Superintendent Eastin that would go out with future frameworks. She reiterated that the special education document is a free document for schools and the State Board has approved it. Deborah Keys stated that the document was distributed at the November's Commission meeting and is available on the web. Chair Abarca also noted that the latest version of the criteria is on the CDE web page (http://www.cde.ca.gov). Commissioner Astore also stated that \$250 million dollars had been allocated from Goals 2000 for the distribution of frameworks to LEAs in the 1999-2000 fiscal year.

F. Other Matters/Audience Comments

Commissioner Dotson stated that he was concerned that the criteria did not address "diversity" of learning styles in students, and he put forth a proposal to invite Dr. Goodman to speak to the Commission.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Commission Chair Astore stated that she would not support such a proposal. She strongly recommended that Commissioner Dotson and others read the article by Stephen Stahl in the June 1999, <u>American Educator</u>, regarding learning styles. She said the Commission needs to focus on their scheduled work, timelines and priorities when bringing speakers forward. The ELA/ELD Criteria have been adopted, and the Commission is moving forward with recommendations in the criteria, which are based on over 200 studies.

Commissioner Dotson said he would let the motion to die without a second, but he wanted it on record that the current criteria are not educating all children.

Commissioner Astore reiterated that all Commissioners should read the article on page 27 of the June 1999 <u>American Educator</u>, as well as the article by Richard Askey regarding the book by Liping Ma, <u>Knowing and Teaching Mathematics</u>.

Commissioner Banker asked for careful consideration before any speakers are invited because of the Commission's work demands.

Commission Chair Astore indicated, in response to a Commissioner's question, that the February 11 Publishers' Briefing is an open meeting for which the ELA/ELD committee is in charge of the agenda; and Chair Astore and Executive Director Griffith indicated travel expenses would be reimbursed for other Commissioners in attendance if requested in advance. Ms. Abarca adjourned the ELA/ELD Subject Matter Committee at 10:15 a.m.

9. History-Social Science Subject Matter Committee

Present: Ken Dotson, Chair; Karen Yamamoto

Absent: Roy Anthony, Vice Chair; Janet Philibosian; Barbara Smith

CFIR Staff: Tom Adams

A. Framework Update and CRP Applications - (Information/Action)

Chair Dotson called the meeting to order. He informed the committee the SBE had approved the CRP recommendations. They include Clarence Walker, William Deverell, Stanley Burstein, Richard Shek, and Mahmood Ibrahim. Chair Dotson updated the committee on two new applicants. Number 7 is a professor of economics at CSU San Bernardino and has been leader of Economics and Number 8 is a professor of geography at UCLA and has worked extensively with the California History-Social Project and K-12 teachers. He currently is on the SAT-9 History-Social Science Augmentation Panel. Chair Dotson stated that the State Board has concerns about the need for gender balance and asked staff for an update on Content Review Panel recruitment.

Tom Adams informed the committee that candidate #6 had withdrawn her application. He relayed other efforts that were being taken. Commissioner Yamamoto informed the committee that she would be contacting scholars. It was agreed that staff and commissioners would continue their efforts to meet the State Board's request.

The issue was raised how this would affect the timeline. After getting information from staff, the committee agreed to keep to the timeline but that some additional meetings of the SMC need to be scheduled. Chair Dotson and Commissioner Yamamoto agreed that committee need to have a call in February and to examine additional nominees for the Content Review Panel. These nominees would then be brought to the SBE in March.

For the March meeting of the Curriculum Commission, the committee agreed to examine the input from CRP members that have been appointed and examine the data from the SAT9. Also, staff will present an analysis of the Framework–Standards alignment and present some options on the framework's format. The format of the RLA appears to be the most appropriate with the standards at the end of each grade level. In

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

addition, the committee agreed that there would a meeting at the beginning of April to discuss additional CRP input. It is hoped that the document can still be place on the web on April 12, 2000.

B. Follow-Up Adoption Update (Information)

There was nothing to report at this time.

C. Other Matters/Audience Comment

Chair Dotson asked if there were other matters. Tom Adams announced that the California History-Social Science Project recently received recognition from the American Historical Association and was awarded the Beveridge Family Prize for Teaching. Usually this award goes to an individual but this year the organization wanted to recognize the outstanding efforts by teachers and professors in California.

Chair Dotson then asked for audience comment and recognized Joseph Maloney of the Citizenship and Law-Related Education Center. Dr. Maloney announced the upcoming Character Education Conference on March 22 and distributed copies of the <u>Picture Yourself in Local Government: Reading Kit</u>. Chair Dotson thanked Dr. Maloney. Chair Dotson asked if there were further comment and hearing none adjourned the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

10. Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee

Present: Leslie Schwarze, Chair; Patrice Abarca, Vice Chair; Sue Stickel; Mary Coronado

Absent: Joe Nation

Staff: Nancy Brynelson, Consultant, CDE; Julian Randolph, Contract Writer

- A. <u>Status of Contract Writer</u>. Dr. Julian Randolph, Professor Emeritus, San Francisco State University, was introduced to the Subject Matter Committee. Dr. Randolph has been hired on a short-term contract to revise the Foreign Language Framework in accordance with the feedback of the field review and the direction of the Subject Matter Committee.
- B. Report on Framework Revision—February Meeting. (Information/Direction/Action)

Leslie Schwarze and Nancy Brynelson reported on a meeting held with Dr. Randolph in December 1999 during which the potential revisions of the framework were discussed. Attending the meeting were Leslie Schwarze and Sue Stickel of the Curriculum Commission; Sherry Griffith, Terry Emmett, Nancy Brynelson, and Arleen Burns of CDE; Hal Wingard of the California Language Teachers Association (CLTA); and Julian Randolph.

Dr. Randolph presented to the Subject Matter Committee a "Proposed Structure of the Foreign Language Framework." In the document Dr. Randolph presented a detailed outline of the framework with the revisions he intends. The revisions are a result of the field review, the review conducted by CLTA, and the direction of the Subject Matter Committee.

Sue Stickel commented that she appreciated how the revised framework will parallel the structure of the Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Frameworks. She also indicated that she looked forward to reviewing the ACTFL guidelines that are proposed for inclusion in the framework. Patrice Abarca clarified for the record decisions that had been made previously by the Subject Matter Committee: 1) that English as a Second Language (ESL) would not be addressed in the Foreign Language Framework; and 2) that waivered programs (for bilingual education) would not be part of the Foreign Language Framework. Mary Coronado commended the organization of the proposed structure suggested by Dr. Randolph. Leslie Schwarze commented that she appreciated how the grade spans delineated in the document would permit entry into the foreign language program at different points within a student's education; she stated her concern regarding the feasibility of districts funding foreign language programs at the earlier levels.

In order to spend time reviewing revisions to the framework in detail, a special meeting of the Subject Matter Committee was recommended. Sue Stickel moved that a special meeting of the Foreign Language

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Subject Matter Committee be scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 2000, 8:30 am-3:00 p.m. in Sacramento. Patrice Abarca seconded the motion. All committee members voted in favor of the motion.

C. Timeline – Adoption 2003/Extension of Current List - (Discussion/Action)

Leslie Schwarze and Nancy Brynelson explained that the Commission and the State Board couldn't legally extend the timeline on the list of currently adopted foreign language materials. An option, however, would be for the State Board to modify its policy to permit the use of Instructional Materials Funds to purchase foreign language materials that had been previously adopted. Sue Stickel moved that the Curriculum Commission recommend to the State Board of Education that the policy be so modified. Mary Coronado seconded the motion. All committee members voted in favor of the motion.

Leslie Schwarze and Nancy Brynelson presented information regarding the timeline for adopting instructional materials for foreign language in 2003. If the framework were approved by the State Board of Education in July 2000 as anticipated, January 2003 would be the earliest possible date for SBE approval of instructional materials (adhering to the 30 month timeline). It was suggested that October 2003 be considered as a date for SBE approval of instructional materials. October 2003 would align with adoption schedules used by the Commission prior to AB 2519 and would provide extra time in the schedule should it be necessary. Commissioner Stickel moved that a recommendation move forward to the full Commission to recommend to the SBE that the adoption for foreign language instructional materials be scheduled for October 2003. Patrice Abarca seconded the motion. All committee members voted in favor of the motion.

D. Other Matters/Audience Comment. No other matters or comments were brought forward, so the Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

(NOTE REGARDING AGENDA ITEM J – REPORTS/ACTION FROM SUBCOMMITTEES: Because guest presenters for the next committee were not available for an early start, the Commissioners accepted Ms. Stickel's recommendation that the full commission reconvene in the interim and begin reporting out from the subject matter committee any action needing full commission consideration. During a working lunch, reports of subject matter committees and full commission action are reported below in agenda item J which included full commission work of 11:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m. and continued 1:30-2:30 p.m., January 21, 2000.)

11. Electronic Resources Ad Hoc Committee

Present: Catherine Banker, Chair; Patty Abarca;

added by Executive Committee 1/21/2000: Mary Coronado

Absent: Joe Nation, Vik Hovsepian

A. Report of Action by the Board to Establish a Subject Matter Committee (Information)

Ms. Banker stated appreciation to the State Board for assigning full committee status to this group. She asked the Executive Committee to consider the issue of membership and Ms. Griffith referred to the Commission procedures which allow for four-five members for a committee during a non-adoption year. Therefore, Chair Astore thanked Ms. Coronado for volunteering to participate on the committee. The three members present deliberated on the committee title, decided to call the committee Electronic Learning Resources.

- B. Elect Vice-Chair (Action). Patty Abarca was elected Vice Chair
- C. <u>Status Report re: RFA, Criteria, BCP for AB 598</u> (Information) Nancy Sullivan, Administrator, Education Technology Office

Ms. Banker welcomed Nancy Sullivan to discuss technology issues in the state, including AB 598. Executive Director Griffith reported that CDE Deputies Lange and Hernandez had confirmed that the

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Curriculum Commission is to work in conjunction with the new advisory body to be developed with the advisory body described in AB 598, the the Commission on Technology and Learning.

Ms. Sullivan also described the Board action in December 1999 to approve board approval of SETS (Statewide Education Technology Services) funded under AB 1761 which will include a project out of the Stanislaus County Office of Education. She also described some of the references found within the web page for the Education Technology office found within the Department's web site, http://www.cde.ca.gov.

E. Demonstration, Electronic Book Format

Presenters: Rod Brawley, Director, CDE Specialized Media and Technology and Doug Kline, Nuvo Media, Mountain View, CA

Judith Brown, CFIR consultant, introduced Rod Brawley and his work to increase access to learning materials for all students with specialized media. Mr. Brawley introduced Doug Kline and Johanna Schmid of NuvoMedia, who provided a review of the history and potential applications of electronic "books" to improve student access to instructional resources.

F. Other Matters/Audience Comment.

<u>Establish ELR Subject Matter Committee 2000 Goals</u>. The committee approved the following goals, which included three which had been offered by Ms. Sullivan in November for consideration:

- 1) Review and comment on draft criteria for learning resources developed by Statewide Education Technology Services (SETS; AB 1761)
- 2) Provide consultation on the training of the reviewers for the SETS learning resources
- 3) Work in conjunction with the new advisory body to be developed, the Commission on Technology and Learning, on common work of both Commissions.
- 4) Recommend that the State Board of Education be provided an information overview of the potential for electronic books within the California adoption process.

Resource for ELR: *Technology Counts'99*. Ms. Banker recommended all Commissioners review the January Education Week annual special report on use of technology in US public education. Excerts of the Technology Counts'99. report were proved. She encouraged all Commissioners to be familiar with this resource, which is available at www.edweek.org (select the "special reports" menu item). Chair Banker noted that the summary is of special interest, including issues raised about teacher access to electronic materials which align to their curriculum standards. Also of interest in the state-by-state comparative data which clearly illustrates differences in teacher determination to use of quality electronic resources to support adopted curriculum standards. Ms. Banker adjourned the committee at 1:25 p.m.

12. Full Curriculum Commission (Reconvenes) 1:30 p.m., January 21, 2000

- J. <u>Reports/Action from Subcommittees</u> Chair Astore reconvened the full Commission during the working lunch, 11:45-12:05 p.m., and again at 1:30 p.m. to consider subcommittee reports and recommended actions of the full commission.
 - (1) <u>Science Subject Matter Committee</u>. Chair Schwartz thanked the Commission for participating in the vote on Science adoption materials. He thanked the CFIR staff, with special praise for Dr. Tom Adams, for the support required to organize and manage the adoption process.
 - (2) <u>Mathematics Subject Matter Committee</u>. Sue Stickel, Chair of the Mathematics Subject Matter Committee reported on two items from the SMC. SMC approved the Math 2001 ITS timeline changes, which will be based on the recommendations to the State Board, which were made by the Executive Committee. Lora Griffin moved to support the recommendation of the Math SMC in support of the Executive Committee motion; motion was seconded and all commissioners approved.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

The Mathematics SMC reviewed applicants for IMAP and CRP members and brought forward 12 Content Review Panelists as recommendations for consideration by the Commission. Lora Griffin asked to what extent ethnicity and gender were considered to ensure the panel members represent the makeup of California. Chair Astore indicated it is her experience that all such efforts seriously pursue representation to reflect the diversity of California. Ms. Griffith confirmed that CDE staff makes every effort to recruit individuals who reflect the diversity of California. The slate of CRP members as recommended by SMC was approved by the full commission (motion by Ms. Norris, second by Mr. Schwartz; all ayes.)

Commissioner Stickel reported that 54 panelists were being commended to the Commission for appointment as math IMAP members. Professional makeup meets the legal requirements for majority of classroom teachers. Professional, geographic and gender representation was reviewed as reported out by the committee. The Commission approved the slate of 54 IMAP members.

Commissioner Stickel indicated concern that IMAP alternates would be important. Lora Griffin made a motion for Commission approval to pursue at least six alternate IMAP members to be considered at the March CC meeting; Ken Dotson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous. Chair Astore complimented Ms. Stickel and staff for the excellent process used for the review and selection of CRP and IMAP applicants. Ms. Griffith thanked Suzanne Rios, Lily Roberts, and Lino Vicente for pulling together the report of the composition of CRP/IMAP selection.

Commissioner Abarca asked for an estimate of projected submissions for the forthcoming math adoption. Sherry Griffith indicated that staff has estimated approximately 20 programs will be submitted.

- (3) <u>Visual and Performing Arts Subject Matter Committee</u>. Executive Director Griffith reported for Commissioner Anthony. The VPA committee reviewed the adoption timeline and asked staff to return in March with a review of the timelines to ensure there will be no unnecessary overlap of adoption activities.
- (4) <u>Health Subject Matter Committee</u>. Veronica Norris reported no action was needed by the full Commission. She thanked the guest speaker for the review of health-related resources.
- (5) English Language Arts/English Language Development Subject Matter Committee. Ms. Abarca reported the discussion of the timeline adjustments requested by the State Board of Education needed to be based on the Executive Committee recommendations. Lora Griffin made the related motion and Ken Dotson seconded it. All Commissioners voted in support of the timeline recommendations to the State Board of Education for ELA/ELD.
 - Ms. Abarca requested thanks be shared with Nancy Brynelson and Deborah Keys to acknowledge their work on the criteria for ELA/ELD. Also, Ms. Abarca thanked the new Commissioners involved in the ELA/ELD criteria for their extra time spent so early in their Commission tenure.
- (6) <u>History-Social Science Subject Matter Committee</u>. Ken Dotson brought forward a proposal from the History-Social Science Subject Matter Committee to increase the number of CRP applicants reviewed by the SMC in order to increase gender representation based on SBE direction. A conference call in February is needed for the review of the additional applicants. Ms. Griffin moved for the Commission to approve a meeting by HSS committee by conference call either February 16 or 23 or another date if necessary and at a time in the afternoon contingent upon availability of all SMC members in order to review additional CRP applications. Ms. Yamamoto seconded the motion. Ms. Stickel asked to confirm that there would be no overlap in membership would occur with the Foreign Language committee, which had been approved for a meeting on February 23. All Commissioners were in favor of the motion. Chair Astore identified several potential CRP applicants for Dr. Adams to contact.

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education D r a f t MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

Mr. Dotson also reported a need to share with other educators that the California council of Social Studies will hold a conference March 3-5 in San Diego and will conduct several sessions on standards and assessments.

- (7) <u>Foreign Language Subject Matter Committee</u>. Commissioner Schwarze, Chair of the Foreign Language SMC, reported that the committee requests approval of the full Commission to have a public framework meeting on February 23, 2000. Ms. Coronado made the motion; Ms. Abarca seconded; all Commissioners were in favor of the motion.
 - Ms. Schwarze reported that the Foreign Language SMC voted to recommend that the SBE modify the policy for use of IMF funds to extend the use of IMF funds for foreign language materials during the lapsed in time before the next adoption is completed. Commissioner Abarca made the motion to recommend the policy be so modified; all Commissioners said "aye." Also, the Foreign Language SMC recommended the Commission request approval from the SBE that the adoption timeline be adjusted to be completed October 2003. The motion passed.
- (8) <u>Electronic Learning Resources Subject Matter Committee</u>. Ms. Banker reported the committee had acted to adopt the name of Electronic Learning Resource Subject Matter Committee for this group which now has SBE approval to function as a full committee in support of Commission work. She reported that the SMC, with its new member appointed by the Executive Committee, Mary Coronado, had elected Patty Abarca as Vice Chair, and had adopted the following goals:
 - a) Review and comment on draft criteria developed by learning resources SETS (Statewide Education Technology Services)
 - b) Provide consultation on the training of the reviewers for the SETS
 - Work in conjunction with the new advisory body, the Commission on Technology and Learning, on common work of both Commissions.
 - d) Recommend that the State Board of Education be provided an information overview of the potential for electronic books within the California adoption process.
- (9) Executive Committee. Chair Astore reported that Executive Committee had agreed to request that all sub-committee meetings be held within the dais (with nameplates up for those members assigned) and that CDE staff associated with each committee will join the Commissioners in the horseshoe as appropriate.

The Executive Committee recommended that the SBE adopt revised timelines for the 2001 Mathematics and 2002 ELA/ELD adoptions to allow SBE to take final action on adoptions in January of 2001 and 2002 respectively. The Commission supported the Executive Committee's recommendations regarding timeline adjustments (previously, the motion from each of the two SMC's had passed unanimously).

Sue Stickel moved that all subject matter committee goals be adopted by the full commission now that the Electronic Learning Resources had approved their goals. Ken Dotson seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously to pass the motion.

Ms. Astore also reported that the Executive Committee requested that the March agenda assign time for the following matters: (1) the Executive Committee is to study and take action to define what is meant by "edits/corrections/changes" within the adoption process; (2) the Executive Committee is to consider a policy regarding Commissioner voting rights on final recommendations for future adoptions; (3) the Executive Committee is to take action to recommend a requirement for errata letters from publishers regarding the notification of errors of fact to go out to consumers of published materials if and when errors are found post-adoption; (4) the Executive Committee is to take action to appoint a Commissioner to serve on the soon-to-be formed the Commission on Technology and Learning as a non-voting members (AB 598).**

An advisory body to the California State Board of Education $D\ r\ a\ f\ t$ MINUTES OF MEETING: January 20-21, 2000

To be Reviewed by the Curriculum Commission on March 16-17, 2000

K. Reports from Commission Liaisons.

<u>CISC</u>. Ms. Astore reported on her work as liaison to CISC, part of the organizational support for the work of the county offices of education. They are pleased to have continued formal connection with the Commission. They appreciated timelines, copy of ELA/ELD criteria, the set of contacts at CDE CFIR staff. They are going to help with CRP search for History-Social Science. There was some discussion about the ELD standards; Ms. Astore had reported that the SPI and SBE were convening a standing advisory group to assist with issues related to language development policy. Ms. Astore reported that the CISC would want to read the criteria and advocate CRP and IMAP panelists who have expertise in working with English learners.

Concurrence Committee of California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP). Judith Brown reported of Eleanor Brown's willingness to report to the Commission in the future on related curriculum issues of the Concurrent Committee of the CSMP. Her first meeting with the Subject Matter Projects will be January 28. Chair Astore encouraged Dr. Brown to visit or forward a written report of concerns related to the Commission from the work of the CSMP.

- L. <u>Individual Commissioner Reports</u>. Ms. Astore asked for reports from individual Commissioners. Ken Dotson passed a message to the Commission from Joe Nation indicating his regret he was only able to attend a brief part of the January 20 meeting due to the work of his political campaign
- M. Other Matters/Audience Comment. Chair Astore thanked the Commissioners for making a professional commitment to attend through to the end of the meeting in order to participate in final actions of the Commission and to ensure a quorum existed for all votes. Ms. Abarca stated appreciation for the news that the Commissioners would receive a General Service Charge card for use in paying for shuttles/taxi services to/from the airport. Ms. Griffith thanked all of the CFIR staff for their contributions to the work in support of the Commission agenda. No further comments were offered from the audience. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m., January 21, 2000.

For further information about these minutes, please contact The Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission (CDSMC) at 654-3361 or the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources (CFIR) Division, California Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA, 95814; telephone (916) 657-3023; fax (916) 657-5437.

Use the following web site to access up-to-date information about the work of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission and the CFIR office: http://www.cde.ca.gov/cilbranch/cc.

Respectfully submitted February 17, 2000: Judith L. Brown, Consultant, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division; phone 916-657-5447; fax 916-657-5437; e-mail jbrown@cde.ca.gov.

C:\CurriculumCommission\ATTnow\cc1-2000minutes.dftF.doc ver 3/1/2000